

# The Religious Inquirer

## AND GOSPEL ANCHOR.

Devoted to the Exposition, Defence and Promulgation of the Christian Religion.

'THOU BRINGEST CERTAIN STRANGE THINGS TO OUR EARS—WE WOULD KNOW, THEREFORE, WHAT THESE THINGS MEAN.'

VOLUME XIV.

SATURDAY, MAY 23, 1835.

NUMBER 8.

### THE INQUIRER AND ANCHOR

Is published simultaneously at Hartford, Conn. and Albany, N. Y. every Saturday at \$2.00 per annum—\$1.50, if paid within four months from the time of subscribing.

J. D. WILLIAMSON, } EDITORS AND  
R. O. WILLIAMS, } PROPRIETORS.

Dixon & Mills, Printers.

The services of the following gentlemen are engaged as regular correspondents.

M. H. SMITH, HARTFORD, CT.  
J. BOYDEN, DUDLEY, MASS.  
C. WOODHOUSE, LANSINGBURGH, N. Y.

### LETTERS TO UNBELIEVERS.

RELIGIOUS OPINIONS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON.

FELLOW CITIZENS :—I conclude my last letter with the assertion that I never knew a man, that I never heard of a man, that I never read of a man, who had examined the evidences of natural and revealed religion with honesty and candor and patience, who remained an unbeliever. I am therefore naturally led to notice the belief of those distinguished men of our country whom you claim as infidels; and I am bound to show, either that they were Christians, or that they were ignorant of the foundation on which Christianity securely rests. The following quotation from the Lectures of Frances Wright will disclose the names of some eminent individuals whom you are exceedingly anxious to enrol on the list of infidelity :—

'Would not the American people do better to seek the opinions of their great men in their good works and those of their confidential contemporaries, than in the trash of the tract-house and the libels of the pulpit? Would they not do well to understand, before they take alarm at the senseless cry of infidel, that Washington, that Jefferson, that Franklin, that John Adams, that Ethan Allen, that Horatio Gates, and the nobler host of worthies who secured this country's independence, were all according to the priestly acceptance of a meaningless word, *infidels*; that is, all disbelieved the compound Jewish and Christian system, and looked upon its mysteries and its miracles as upon nursery tales?'—*Lectures*, p. 13.

In the present communication I wish to invite your attention to the religious opinions of Thos. Jefferson. I shall prove from his own writings and from a letter from his grand daughter, 'that he called himself a Christian, and wished to be so considered by his fellow-men; that he disclaimed the name of unbeliever, and desired that his reputation might never be blackened by the epithet of infidel.

1. Did Mr. Jefferson disclaim infidelity and call himself a Christian? Read the following extract from a letter to the celebrated Dr. Rush :

'In some of the delightful conversations with you, in the evenings of 1798—99, and which served as an anodyne to the afflictions of the crisis through which our country was then laboring, the Christian religion was sometimes our topic; and then I promised you that, one day or other, I would give you my views of it. They are the result of a life of inquiry and reflection, and very different from the anti-Christian system imputed to me by those who know nothing of my opinions. To the corruptions of Christianity I am indeed opposed; but not to the genuine precepts of Jesus himself. I am a Christian, in the only sense in which he wished any one to be; sincerely attached to his doctrines, in preference to all others, ascribing to himself every human excellence, and believing he never claimed any other.'—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 506.

What do you make of this testimony? Does he not affirm that his views of the Gospel are very different from that anti-Christian or infidel system sometimes imputed to him by those ignorant of his religious opinions? Does he not unequivocally declare himself a Christian believer? Does he not ascribe to Jesus human perfection; every human excellence? How can you dispose of such explicit statements? Will unbelievers now assent to these declarations? No. Let them no longer, then, claim a person whose very words pronounce their condemnation.

What views did Mr. Jefferson entertain concerning Jesus and his religion? Read the following extracts from his published letters :—

'In this state of things among the Jews, Jesus appeared. His parentage was obscure; his condition poor; his education null; his natural endowments great; his life correct and innocent; he was meek, benevolent, patient, firm, disinterested, and of the sublimest eloquence.

'He corrected the deism of the Jews, confirming them in their belief of one only God, and giving them juster notions of his attributes and government. His moral doctrines relating to kindred and friends, were more pure and perfect than those of the most correct of the philosophers and greatly more so than those of the Jews; and they went far beyond both in inculcating universal philanthropy, not only to kindred and friends, gathering all into one family, under the bonds of love, charity, peace, common wants, and common aids.

'The precepts of philosophy and of the Hebrew code laid hold of actions only. He pushed his scrutinies into the heart of man, erected his tribunal in the region of his thoughts, and purified the waters at the fountain head. He taught emphatically the doctrine of a future state, which

was either doubted or disbelieved by the Jews;—and wielded it with efficacy as an important incentive, supplementary to the other motives to moral conduct.—*Works*, vol. iii. pp. 598—9.

'This free exercise of reason is all I ask for the vindication of the character of Jesus. We find in the writings of his biographers, . . . sublime ideas of the Supreme Being, aphorisms and precepts of the purest morality and benevolence sanctioned by a life of humility, innocence, and simplicity of manners, neglect of riches, absence of worldly ambition and honors, with an eloquence and persuasiveness which had not been surpassed. These could not be the inventions of the grovelling authors who relate them. They are far beyond the powers of their feeble minds. They show that there was a character, the subject of their history, whose splendid conceptions were above all suspicion of being interpolations from their hands.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 326.

'It is the innocence of his character, the purity and sublimity of his moral precepts, the eloquence of the apologues in which he conveys them, that I so much admire; sometimes, indeed, needing indulgence to Eastern hyperbolism.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 321.

Do your writers speak in this manner concerning Christ and his Gospel? I have lately read not a little of the writings of modern unbelievers and I have found nothing respecting Jesus and his religion but condemnation. Why, then, will you persist in claiming a man whose very words contradict your constant assertions? But a few more passages shall finish this division.

'The doctrines of Jesus are simple, and tend all to the happiness of man. 1. That there is one only God, and he all-perfect. 2. That there is a future state of rewards and punishments. 3. That to love God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself is the sum of religion. These are the great points on which he endeavored to reform the religion of the Jews. . . . Had the doctrines of Jesus been preached always as pure as they came from his lips, the whole civilized world would now have been Christian.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 349.

'The Christian religion, when divested of the rags in which they have enveloped it, and brought to the original purity and simplicity of its benevolent institutor, is a religion of all others most friendly to liberty, science, and the freest expansion of the human mind.'—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 463.

'If the moral precepts innate in man, and made a part of his physical constitution as necessary for a social being, if the sublime doctrines of philan-



thropism and deism taught us by Jesus of Nazareth, in which all agree, constitute true religion, then without it, this would be, as you again say, something not fit to be named, even indeed in hell.—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 301.

I could quote many more passages of a similar description; but these must be sufficient to satisfy the most skeptical that the writer never belonged to your party. You must perceive the injustice of claiming one as an unbeliever who could conscientiously utter such sentiments respecting Jesus and his religion. You must admit that your female leader has discovered no small share of ignorance or dishonesty in her bold and unsupported assertions.

3. Did Mr. Jefferson rejoice in the spread of Christianity? Did he desire to have one denomination prevail? Or did he wish, like your writers, to banish the Gospel from the face of the earth? Read the following extracts, and then decide these inquiries for yourselves:

'I rejoice that in this blessed country of free inquiry and belief, which has surrendered its creed and conscience to neither kings nor priests, the genuine doctrine of one only God is reviving; and I trust that there is not a young man now living in the United States who will not die a Unitarian.'—*Works*, vol. iv. pp. 349, 350.

'Happy in the prospect of a restoration of primitive Christianity, I must leave to younger athletes to encounter and lop off the false branches which have been engrafted into it by the mythologists of the middle and modern ages. I am not aware of the peculiar resistance to Unitarianism which you ascribe to Pennsylvania . . . This doctrine has not yet been preached to us; but the breeze begins to be felt which precedes the storm, and fanaticism is all in a bustle, shutting its doors and windows to keep it out. But it will come, and drive before it the foggy mists of Platonism which have so long obscured our atmosphere. I am in hopes some of the disciples of your institution (Harvard University) will become missionaries to us of these doctrines truly evangelical, and open our eyes to what has been so long hidden from them. A bold and eloquent preacher would be nowhere listened to with more freedom than in this State, nor with more firmness of mind.'

'He might be excluded by our hierophants from their churches and meeting-houses, but would be attended in the fields by whole acres of hearers and thinkers. Missionaries from Cambridge would soon be greeted with more welcome than from the tritheistical school of Andover.—Such are my wishes, such would be my welcomes warm and cordial as the assurances of my esteem and respect for you.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 354.

'I have to thank you for your pamphlets on the subject of Unitarianism, and to express my gratification with your efforts for the revival of primitive Christianity in your quarter . . . And a strong proof of the solidity of the primitive faith is its restoration, as soon as a nation arises which vindicates to itself the freedom of religious opinion and its external divorce from the civil authority. The pure and simple unity of the Creator of the universe is now all but ascendent in the Eastern States; it is drawing in the West, and advancing towards the South; and I confidently expect that the present generation will see Unitari-

anism become the general religion of the United States. The Eastern presses are giving us many excellent pieces on the subject, and Priestley's learned writings on it are or should be in every hand.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 360.

Many more passages of a similar import might be quoted did my object require them or my limits permit their introduction. Is this the language of an unbeliever? Are these the words of an infidel? Are these the wishes and desires of an anti-Christian. Let your own publications answer. Let the infinite difference of your views and those expressed above cause your silence in future respecting this distinguished patriot.

4. Did Mr. Jefferson feel hurt at the imputation of infidelity? Did he speak of infidels as a class with which he had no connexion? Did he accuse them of rejecting the Gospel without proper inquiry? For an answer to these questions, you may read the following extracts:—

'I promised you that, one day or other, I would give you my views of the Christian religion.—They are very different from that *anti-Christian* system imputed to me by those who know nothing of my opinions.'—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 506.

'They [the Orthodox clergy] wish it to be believed that he can have no religion who advocates its freedom.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 194.

'They [the doctrines of Jesus] have been still more disfigured by the corruptions of schismaticizing followers, who have found an interest in sophisticating and perverting the simple doctrines he taught, by engrafting on them the mysticisms of a Grecian sophist, flitting them into subtilities, and obscuring them with jargon, until they have caused good men to reject the whole in disgust, and to view Jesus himself as an imposter.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 349.

'Their blasphemies have driven thinking men into infidelity, who have too hastily rejected the supposed author himself, with the errors so falsely imputed to him.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 349.

'If histories so unlike as those of Hercules and Jesus can by a fertile imagination and allegorical interpretations be brought to the same tally, no line of distinction remains between fact and fancy.'—*Works*, vol. iv. pp. 296-7.

And what is the meaning of all these remarks? Was the writer an anti-Christian, when he claimed the imputation of infidelity? Was he one of the good men who had rejected the Gospel in disgust on account of the absurdities of some believers? Was he one of the number who had been driven into infidelity, and too hastily rejected the Christian religion, on account of the cruel doctrines of Calvinism? I suppose by this time you must be fully convinced that my position is proved. Under each of the divisions I could have greatly enlarged. I am sorry to be obliged to omit more than three quarters of the extracts I have made from his works with a special reference to this controversy; but the length of my article warns me to conclude with the still more convincing testimony which yet remains.

5. Finally, then, I present you, in proof of my position, a letter which I have received from a grand-daughter of Mr. Jefferson. If any person can know the truth on this question, it is this lady. For she was the constant companion of her grandfather for a considerable period, and from child-

hood enjoyed, to a remarkable degree, his affection and confidence.

—January 27, 1834.

Sir—Your letter of the 23d January was this morning received, and I hasten to reply to it willing to give all the information I can on a subject of so much personal interest to myself, but compelled, for many reasons, to request that whatever use you make of the few details I have it in my power to furnish, my own name may be kept out of sight. I apprehend, however, I can add but little to the information you already possess on the subject of Mr. Jefferson's religious opinions, which judging from the spirit of your letter, is both copious and correct. Your plan of making him speak for himself is unquestionably the best that can be pursued; nor do I conceive it possible for one, after an impartial perusal of his published works, to persist in applying to him the name of infidel; a name which for himself he ever disclaimed.—Still his letters on religious subjects are scattered through the body of his correspondence, and much additional light may be thrown on the nature of his opinions by their being brought together, arranged, and condensed, in the able manner in which I have no doubt they will be in the work you are about to publish.

I regret that I can say but little of his last moments, as I was, unhappily for myself, absent from his dying bed. But I have it on the testimony of others, that he died as he had lived, a Christian philosopher. He was perfectly aware of the approach of death, and his last days were marked by a serenity most perfect. His thoughts were undisturbed by self-reproach, fear, or regret. His life had been long and most purely virtuous. In the latter part of it, however, his bodily sufferings had been great, and although he had borne them with exemplary patience he could not but feel that death came as a friend to release him from the burden of years and infirmities. He felt, too, that his work was done; and even amid those wanderings of the mind which precede dissolution and indicate that the soul is already poisoning her wings for flight, the words, 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace,' were among the last that he uttered. He had previously given his parting admonitions to the younger members of the family; whilst on each individual of the sorrowing friends who surrounded him he had bestowed some expression of comfort or tenderness. He died a Christian; for although his views of the mission of Jesus were to a certain degree peculiar and different from those of others, yet he thought them the true ones, and claimed for himself the name of a follower of Christ. He always said he was a Christian, in what he understood the true sense of the word, and according to the doctrine which he believed were truly those of Jesus.

Mr. Jefferson's character, in spite of the mistakes which prevail among many persons in regard to it, was essentially Christian, and could have been formed under no other influences than those of the Gospel. He was, if ever man was, merciful, pure in heart, a peace-maker, one who forgave his enemies not seven times but seventy times seven, doing his alms in secret, and praying, not at the corners of the streets, but in the retirement of his closet; and his heavenly Father, who heard him in secret, will perhaps, one day reward



him openly, when he shall receive from men the justice due to his true character and principles.

Mr. Jefferson's religious opinions have been variously represented, and almost always misrepresented. What I now assert I do on the authority of his own words and actions, heard and witnessed by myself. He entertained the greatest possible admiration and veneration for the character and doctrines of Jesus, and few persons devote more time than he did to the reading and study of the New Testament. He had carefully prepared for his own use an abstract of the life and sayings of Jesus, extracting from the writings of the evangelists such chapters or part of chapters as appeared to him of the greatest power and beauty, and arranging them so as to form a continuous narrative; but a copy of the New Testament as it stands was always within reach of the chair which he usually occupied when he wrote or read. He frequently had recourse to it in his moments of retirement, and never more than when under the pressure of sorrow he sought the rest which is offered to the heavy laden. Upon one occasion, having experienced an affliction of the severest kind, he was found by the person who first ventured to interrupt the retirement of his grief, with the sacred volume in his hands; and in this he continued to read, at intervals, the whole time during which the agony of his feelings absorbed all thoughts but those which even then he could give to the words of the Saviour.

Nor was his love for the Scriptures entirely confined to the writings of the evangelist. Although he never appeared to take the same pleasure in reading the Old Testament, yet there were parts which he greatly admired; many of the Psalms of David especially. Several of them I have heard him repeat from beginning to end, such as the twenty-third, 'The Lord is my shepherd;' and the fifteenth, the metrical version of which,

Lord, who's the happy man that may  
To thy blest courts repair?

I have seen them copied out in his own hand more than once. He was also in the habit of writing down such occasional hymns as pleased and satisfied him, and I have one or two written on small scraps of paper which I carefully preserve.

It may be worth while to mention, in passing, that his voice and manner were particularly impressive when he read aloud, as he sometimes did passages from the New Testament, or repeated the Psalms of David. There was a feeling and an earnestness in his tones which added much to the effect of what he read. Of sacred music he was particularly fond, and especially of the old psalm-tunes, which he regretted much to find giving way in favor of more modern compositions. His voice continued sweet and unbroken to the last years of his life, and I have frequently heard him singing passages of the old psalms.

He was as regular an attendant at church as circumstances permitted, and frequently overcame obstacles of roads and weather which might have deterred younger and more vigorous men. He preferred the liturgy of the church of England to any other form of worship, and always kept by him an Episcopal prayer-book. Such indications as these are the more worthy of notice, because Mr. Jefferson is well known to have been a fearless and uncompromising man, paying small

respect either to persons or what he considered prejudices. His worst enemies, have never, I believe, charged him with hypocrisy, and his assertions of independence both in speech and action has often caused him to be misunderstood and misrepresented.

He was particularly sturdy on the subject of his religious belief, viewing with peculiar abhorrence all attempts to establish any thing like an inquisition over the free thoughts of the mind, particularly on subjects which, far beyond human jurisdiction, lie between man and his God, to whom only he should be required to render an account.—But to friendly inquiry, and even admonition, Mr. Jefferson was always open and gentle, and I have been pleased and surprised to see what different impressions from those which they brought, good religious persons would often carry away, after long and frank converse with him on topics of which he equally with themselves admitted the importance, although perhaps his particular views might be different from their own.

With regard to Mr. Jefferson's belief in a future state, he has himself expressly declared it in more than one of his writings; but it is also a fact that the last words ever traced by his hands were an expression of the hope and expectation of rejoining the wife of his youth, whom he had never ceased to regret, and a daughter whose untimely death had robbed him of one staff of his old age, although he was blest with a surviving daughter whose devoted affection to himself he repaid by the most unbounded attachment.

Such, Sir, are the best answers I can give to your questions addressed to me on the subject of my dear grandfather's opinions. But, after all, the best answer to the accusations of his open enemies, and the more dangerous assertions of his pretended friends, is to be found in the whole tenor of a life passed in the exercise of every Christian virtue and devoted to the service of his fellow-men. A distinction which he liked to draw between the lessons of Heathen philosophy and those of Jesus was, that the former had for their object to teach man to take care of his own happiness, whilst the latter turned his thoughts to the happiness of others. And if all were not happy who came within the sphere of Mr. Jefferson's influence, it was not for want of the most constant efforts on his part to make them so. In small things as in great the same ardent desire to do good formed the spring of all his actions. His kind offices beginning at home extended themselves in circles until they reached the utmost limits of his powers. At home he had been the best husband, and was the best father and grandfather, the kindest master, the most faithful and active friend, the most useful neighbor. He was loved best always where best known. Those who approached him nearest were the most devoted in their affection and veneration, and it was only as men receded from him that they lost sight of his true proportions, which thus became distorted through the mists of prejudice and lost the symmetry which really belonged to them. I repeat again my firm belief that such a character as Mr. Jefferson's could have been formed under no other influences than those of the Gospel; that there is in this world but one sort of tree capable of bearing such fruit.

I make no apology for these encomiums on so near a relation. Mr. Jefferson has ceased to be long exclusively to his family. He belongs to mankind, and we of his blood should consider ourselves as holding such information as our situation in regard to him enables us to become possessed of in trust for those who ask it of us, and who we believe, will make a worthy use of it. We speak as of one whom we love more than others can do, simply because we have known him better. Whatever light, therefore, this letter can throw upon the truth, as it regards a good and great man, is yours, Sir, to make such use of as seems best to you; reserving only, as my own privilege, the right which belongs to every female, of avoiding public notice.

With sentiments of great respect,  
I remain yours, &c.

Now, unbelievers, what will you do with all this mass of evidence? You cannot assert, with the least shadow of truth, that Mr. Jefferson ever uttered or published a syllable which contradicts a single sentiment I have quoted. No! All these opinions he did cordially embrace. All this is positive proof which cannot be refuted. But you can affirm that he has written some things which other Christians reject, and that he has spoken plainly concerning some parts of the Scriptures, Calvinism, the Orthodox clergy, and the apostles. All this I admit; but what does this prove? Because I have expressed my honest views respecting human systems of divinity, ambitious priests, or some things recorded in the Bible, am I therefore to be classed among unbelievers? This is surely a new mode of reasoning for infidels; and I will not charge this absurdity upon your system, until I find it stated in your publications.

You may also contend that Christians of different sects have called Mr. Jefferson an unbeliever. This I acknowledge; but what does this prove? Are you in the habit of taking the assertions of Orthodox believers in proof of any position which you reject? Why should you in this instance? On what ground have they preferred this charge against him? Simply because he did not believe so much concerning Jesus and his religion as they did. Is this treating him according to Gospel rules? Is this conduct consistent with the fundamental principles of Protestantism? I freely grant that my belief on several points of Christianity differs essentially from that of Mr. Jefferson. I do not know as he would agree in all particulars with any denomination in Christendom. But what of all this? Is not the Bible the common standard of divine truth? Has he not as much right to investigate as any other individual?—Must I condemn one neighbor for believing too much and another for not believing enough? Am I the infallible Pope? From whom have I received any such commission? No. I am bound by the Gospel to do unto others as I would have others do unto me. I have no willingness to be called an infidel because I cannot assent to the creed of my Orthodox friend; neither have I any disposition to condemn Mr. Jefferson because he could not receive all the articles of my faith, so long as I know he wished to be regarded a follower of Jesus.

But the wrong-doing of Christians is no excuse for your misconduct. You profess to be govern-



ed by the principles of common honesty, I suppose. Now I demand to know upon what authority you claim Mr. Jefferson as an infidel.—You have seen that he called himself a Christian, and wished to be so regarded by his fellow-men.—You have seen that he endeavored to regulate his life by the precepts of Jesus, and died in expectation of admission to the heaven which he revealed. You have seen that his family regard this charge of infidelity as a gross and shameless slander upon the character of their venerated relative. Can you consider your course honest, fair, just, right? I appeal to your common sense. I appeal to the community. Wherever this distinguished man is to be classed, he evidently does not belong to your party. I have no further interest in the question than to have the truth prevail, and if this be your object, you will no longer claim Thomas Jefferson as an infidel.

B. WHITMAN.

## Communications.

Original.

### ESSAYS ON DEITY.

Number Four.

#### OMNIPRESENCE OF GOD.

'Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; If I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there! If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.' Ps. cxxxix: 7-10,

In the science of Theology there is no subject more interesting than the universal presence of Deity. It is fruitful with the most exalted ideas of His nature and perfections. The sentiment, however, is not obvious to every mind. It needs some reflection and research. We are much inclined to judge of God by ourselves; to ascribe to Him our worst passions and our limited nature. We are confined within certain limits, and our attention must be directed only to a few objects.—We attribute the same imperfection to Him, 'whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain.' Such views are derogatory to God. In order to correct them, we shall in this number present the subject in a more consistent and elevating form. According to our general plan we shall present a definition of our subject. Saurin says, 'The omnipresence of God is that universal property by which he communicates himself to all, diffuses himself through all, and is the great director of all.' How grand is God! He fills, bounds and corrects all. The old philosophers said of Him, that 'His centre was every where, and his circumference nowhere.' We shall now bring the subject to the test of examination; for at this day the keen spirit of inquiry is abroad, and proof is demanded of every position, not excepting the existence of God.

I. If God is limited in his presence or perfections in any respect, he must be imperfect, which at once destroys our idea of God. But we see the effects and signs of an omnipotent Being through the whole creation. There is a creative intelligence which has established the order, dependencies and harmony of nature. God has diffused and spread abroad his perfections even to infinity.

The vast whole  
What fancied scene can bound? O'er its broad realm,  
Immeasur'd, and immeasurably spread,  
From age to age resplendent lightnings urge,  
In vain, their flight perpetual; distant, still,  
And ever distant from the verge of things.  
So vast the space or opening space that swells,  
Through every part so infinite alike.'

When tempests sweep over the world, God is there! When the electric fire thunders and flashes in the heavens, God is there! When the sun rises, 'rejoicing in the east,' throwing his smiles over creation, God is there! When the curtains of darkness cover the earth, God is there! 'The darkness and the light are both alike to him.' 'I ascend into heaven, He is there; in peerless splendor, ineffable majesty; diffusing from an inexhaustible fountain, the mighty tide of light and life, and love from world to world, and from system to system. If I descend into the grave he is there also; still actively and manifestly employed in the same benevolent pursuit: still, though in a different manner, promoting the calm, but unceasing career of vitality and happiness; harmoniously leading on the silent circle of decomposition and reorganization, fructifying the cold and gloomy regions of the tomb; rendering death itself the mysterious source of reproduction and new existence; and thus literally making the 'dry bones live,' and the 'dead sing praises' to his name.'

II. God is also discoverable in the moral world. Tyranny and oppression sometimes appear to triumph. Nation rises against nation. Wars and commotions destroy the peace of society. But how soon do we see the great Sovereign controlling human passions, and preparing the elements of moral beauty. He is seen walking in the earth, 'in the cool of the day,' stilling the madness of the people; causing 'the wrath of man to praise him and restraining the remainder.' As nature declares 'the glory of God,' so the moral world will unite with it and endless and perfect praise will be the result! 'The same chain embraces the physical and moral worlds, binds the past to the present, to the future, the future to eternity.'

A consciousness of the divine Presence has animated and consoled the wise and the good of all ages. A belief has ever prevailed that neither virtue nor vice will go unnoticed. Under its influence many have willingly suffered as martyrs for the cause of truth and virtue. For the purity of their motives they have appealed to Him who sees the inmost recesses of every heart; and who has solemnly declared 'that He will render to every man according to his deeds.'

On the vicious, the effect is directly the reverse. The very thought that God sees them is sufficient to poison every enjoyment. Go where they may, the same eye is upon them. 'Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting,' is written on every object. With all the strivings of the human heart, it has been found utterly impracticable to destroy this all pervading truth. It is found among the most enlightened, as well as the most savage of our race. To illustrate our subject, and the general belief of mankind, we present the following Arabian tale as related by Mr. Harris.

'As Solomon was one day walking with a person in Palestine, his companion said to him with horror, 'what hideous spectre is that which approaches us? I don't like his visage. Send me

I pray thee, to the remotest mountain of India.—Solomon complied, and the very moment he was sent off, the spectre arrived. Solomon, (said he) how came that fellow here? I was to have fetched him from the remotest mountain of India.—Solomon answered, *Angel of death thou wilt find him there.*'  
c. s.

### INFANT DAMNATION AGAIN.

Original.

Reader, what do you think of this lovely doctrine? My mind has been turned to this revolting theme, in consequence of attending the funeral of a child 7 weeks old. The Rev. Mr. Otis of this town officiated on the occasion. I have no idea that the Rev. gentleman holds to the old, gone by notion of roasting infants not a span long. Neither do I believe he intends to preach such a doctrine. But I can inform the gentleman, that, on that occasion, he did in fact inculcate the idea that infants were exposed to the pains of hell forever: For he in the first place read one of Watts hymns as follows:

'Great God on what a slender thread,  
Hangs everlasting things;  
The eternal state of all the dead,  
Upon life's feeble strings.

Infinite joy or endless woe  
Attends on every breath;—

Now in the name of reason, what can we make out of such words as these, used on the occasion of the burial of an infant.

'Infinite joy or endless woe,  
Attends on every breath.'

Well; the child had breathed many times, and no one will pretend it had done any thing to secure its eternal well being; and the poet has told us that, 'the eternal state of ALL the dead, depend on life's feeble strings.' O sad estate of human wretchedness! If this is really the case, we ought to mourn and lament, that God, in his infinite mercy, did not execute the sentence pronounced against our first parents; as understood by our partialist brethren, on the day they transgressed the command not to eat of the forbidden tree. Yea we should call on the earth and all that is therein to mourn in sackcloth, and curse the day of their birth; and instead of calling on men to praise the Lord for his goodness, we well might call on them to stand aghast, for fear of the monster who had called them into existence under such dreadful circumstances.

J. C.  
Lebanon, April 15, 1835.

### PARTIALISM.

Oh, Partialism! how long wilt thou boast thyself over every name and denomination under heaven: how long will you keep the creature, man, subject to vanity—how long will you continue to dress yourself up in the garb of christianity—how long will you continue to mingle with our devotions—how long will you continue to curdle the purest waters of social intercourse? Till sin shall be finished and transgression has an end—till the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpents head—till all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest—till love shall overcome hatred, and then shall the pure principles of Universalism reign predominant over the wide domain of God's dominions. [Mag. & Adv.]



## INQUIRER AND ANCHOR.

SATURDAY, MAY 23, 1835.

**JUBILEE IN HELL.**—It will be seen from the following which we cut from the New York Evangelist for March 14, that there must be, about these days a time of rejoicing in the miserable abodes of the damned. In former times it was supposed that the miseries of the damned in hell would know no intermission, or cessation through the endless ages of eternity. But the Rev. Mr. Finney, the author of the following extract, has poured some new light upon this dark subject. There can be no doubt that Mr. Finney knows as much about hell and its inhabitants as any man living. He has preached it as much, and described it with its devils, and all its infernal apparatus of torture as often, and as minutely as any man. We know not whether he has any communication with his satannic majesty, and receives from him a report of what is going on, nor will we inquire how he obtains his knowledge. It is enough for us to know that his evidence is such that he has 'no doubt' of the truth of what he asserts, and when a minister has no doubts, why should the people be doubtful? But we are wondering. We were about to say that in these latter days, even the inhabitants of hell have their seasons of rejoicings. About these days they must be holding their jubilee. If any man has a lingering doubt that the presbyterians are very pious people, or that they love one another most sincerely, let him hear Mr. Finney. These are his words.

These things in the Presbyterian church, their contentions and janglings are so ridiculous, so wicked, so outrageous, that no doubt there is a jubilee in hell every year, about the time of the meeting of the General Assembly. And if there are tears in heaven no doubt there would be tears shed over the difficulties of the Presbyterian Church. Ministers have been dragged from home, year by year, and perhaps have left a revival in progress, and gone up to the General Assembly, and there heard debates and witnessed a spirit by which their souls have been grieved, and their hearts hardened, and they have gone home ashamed of their church, and ashamed to ask God to pour out his spirit upon such a contentious body.

Let the reader carefully peruse the above passage, and consider from whence it came. Mr. Finney is a Presbyterian, and of course has a much better opportunity to know them, and understand their spirit than we have. Being counted by them as heretics, we of course must stand in the outer court of their temple, but Mr. Finney has been into the 'sanctum sanctorum' and admitted to a knowledge of all the mysteries behind the veil. Hence we are inclined to believe that he draws a true picture of their standing and character. We are right glad that they are coming to themselves. In their blindness they have long said 'we are rich,' but now they are some of them able to see they are 'poor and miserable and blind and naked.' They come home from the assembly 'ashamed of their church.' We are glad of it, we have long been ashamed of them, and we rejoice that they are beginning to be ashamed of themselves. It affords an evidence which we have long desired to see that they are not utterly lost to all sense of shame, and we hope that ere long they may be led to repentance. If what they say of one another is true, there is certainly not a more ungodly set of men on earth than these same Presbyterians, who before the world claim to be considered the salt of the earth.

By the way, we have a word for the ear of Br. Thomas of Philadelphia before we close. Br. T. you ought not to complain of Dr. Ely for retreating from the controversy with you. You know that the Dr. gave as a reason for discontinuing the discussion, the fact that he was going to attend the General Assembly. Now the Dr. is a benevolent man. He pities the condition of the miserable inhabitants of hell, and he wants to let them have a jubilee occasionally. He knoweth that hell is filled with rejoicing, when the Presbyterians quarrel, and he cannot deny them, the lit

tle comfort they may take in seeing him and his brethren by the ears.

Seriously however, this picture of the Presbyterian Assembly, is truly worthy of serious attention, and in view of it we may significantly say, 'Behold how these brethren love one another.' If this is the spirit of the Presbyterian Church we say with one of old, 'My soul, come not into their secret, &c.'

I. D. W.

**CHRIST THE FIRST FRUITS.**—The apostle Paul speaks of the resurrection of Christ on this wise. 'But now is Christ risen from the dead, and became the first fruits of them that slept.' I Cor. xv. 20.

There is more meaning in these words 'first fruits' than the casual reader would be likely to discover:—and it is the object of this article to illustrate and explain their bearing upon the subject of the resurrection of the dead to which they are applied. Calmet gives us the first explanation of the 'first fruits' as they were offered among the Jews.

'They were presents made to God of part of the fruits of the harvest, to express the submission, dependence, and thankfulness of the offerers. They were offered in the temple before the crop was gathered; and when the harvest was over, before any private person used the corn. The first of these fruits, offered in the name of the nation was a sheaf of barley, gathered on the 15 of Nisan (August) in the evening and threshed in the court of the temple. After it was cleansed, about three pints of it were roasted and pounded in water. Over this was thrown a log of oil and a handful of incense; and the priest taking the offering, waved it before the Lord towards the four cardinal points, throwing a handful of it in the fire on the altar, and keeping the rest.' After this all were at liberty to get in the harvest.

There were besides these, several other kinds of fruits, offered with appropriate ceremonies, which we have not room to describe particularly. The first fruits of the different kinds of grain, as also of the increase of the flocks were offered to the Lord, and our remark will hold good in its application to them all. They were specimens of the harvest that was to follow, and the lump that remained was sanctified and made holy by this offering of the first fruits.

Now the reader will bear in mind, that it is in direct reference to these offerings, that Christ is called the 'first fruits' of them that slept. If therefore the figure used by the Apostle is good, and the parallel holds in its most important particular, then it will follow that the harvest of the dead is sanctified by the first fruits which have been offered. This would be the legitimate inference from the figure.—For if the first fruits sanctified the harvest, so shall Christ sanctify those of whom he in his risen glory is the first fruits.

This inference is sanctioned by the clear and explicit testimony of the Apostle. In his Epistle to the Romans Chap. xi. he says. 'If the first fruits be holy the lump also shall be holy.' Let this text be coupled with the one already under consideration, and the doctrine is as joyful as the testimony is clear. In one, the apostle declares, that Christ has 'risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept: and in the other he asserts, if the first fruits be holy the Lump also shall be holy.'

In the original offering it would indeed have been a most singular circumstance, had the Jews offered the first fruits, and found them good, and then found a harvest blasted and worthless. The truth was, that the first fruits were but a specimen of the harvest,

and in all cases the husbandman had a right to expect a crop, which should correspond, both in kind and quality with these fruits. So according to the apostle, it is in the ingathering of that harvest which God will reap from the field of death. We have a right to look for a harvest which shall be both in nature and character like the first fruits.' Hence we conclude, that the figure of the text must be most sadly mutilated, before it can harmonize with the popular notion, that a great part of the human race, will come in from the grave little better than inficite devils; and certainly it reflects but little honour upon the name of the Saviour to make him the first fruits of a harvest so utterly worthless.

If in ancient Israel a person had designed to learn what would be the quality of the harvest, he might have obtained all necessary information, by an examination of the first fruits that were brought to the temple. So in the case before us. If we wish to know what will be the nature and character of man in the resurrection state, we may look to Christ as the first fruits, and know that we shall be like him. If he in his risen triumph over death, was sinful and corrupt, then may we conclude that we shall be so too. But if he was holy, then shall the harvest also be holy.

These views of the resurrection are as honorable to God as they are consolatory to man. They present the great Creator engaged in a work that is worthy the character of a God of infinite perfections. He is seen raising the sleeping millions into life, not to gratify a malignant spirit of revenge, or to perpetrate sin and suffering; but for the more noble and God-like purpose of rendering them holy and happy in his presence? This is the harvest that is worth the gathering. It was this that enabled the apostle to endure hardness as a good soldier, for he was cheered in every hour of trial with the consolatory assurance, that, though now he was subject to the law of sin and death, yet, the morning of the resurrection shall find him in the image of his beloved Lord and master. Bless the Lord oh! my soul, and all that is within me! Bless his holy name! The first fruits have been offered, 'without spot or blemish.' The final ingathering shall come, and holy angels, with the myriads of the redeemed made white in the blood of the Lamb, shall shout the harvest-home.

I. D. W.

**DESIGN OF THE DIVINE LAW.**—It is by no means a useless and unprofitable inquiry, what is the design of that moral law which was given by the Creator for the regulation of human conduct? Not is it the result of an unjustifiable and impertinent curiosity.—It is a question in which all are interested, and which has an important bearing upon every system of morals and religion. If we ascertain the object of law, and find that object to be a good one, we naturally yield a more willing and constant obedience. We have stronger motives to obey, for the reason that obedience more deeply interests ourselves.

It is believed that this subject is not always correctly understood, or if understood, is not always correctly represented. By religionists at the present day, the law of God is too often set forth in the light of an arbitrary command; that has but very little connexion or concern with the happiness of those who obey. Obedience is enforced more from the consideration that God sternly and peremptorily re-



quires it, than that man is benefited by it. And men are taught to act more for the glory of God and the fear of his wrath than for the happiness of themselves and their fellow men. To act for the promotion of their own happiness is called selfishness, and denominated sinful.

And the law moreover is invested with a kind of unapproachable sanctity, which raises it above the enjoyments and every day affairs of life. It is considered as something awfully sacred, the violation of which involves the most tremendous and even endless consequences. Under such circumstances the constitutional fear of this tremendous wrath, where every faculty is expected to obey, renders even obedience, missing.

Now it seems to us require but a very little discrimination to discover this to be a wrong view of the divine law. That obedience is required for the glory of God may be admitted. Unquestionably man was made, as the Westminster Catechism says, 'to glorify God and enjoy him forever.' But it is a wrong notion to suppose that God is glorified in the endless suffering of men, or their forced obedience to a mere arbitrary command. His glory is manifested in the perfection of his works and the diffusion of happiness. Hence man was created to enjoy God and be happy. And in attempts to secure his own happiness and that of his fellow beings he displays the glory of God, as well as the excellency of his own nature. Created a moral being, the law was adapted to his constitution and obedience required that he might be happy. The end, or object of the law, then, is the happiness of those who are required to obey; and through that, the glory of God. As a judicious writer observes,

On considering the nature of the Supreme Being, reason gives us much ground to believe, that the chief design of all the commandments which he has given to men, is to promote their happiness.—Independent and self-sufficient, that Supreme Being has nothing to exact from us for his own interest or felicity. By our services he cannot be benefited, nor by our offences injured. When he created the world, it was benevolence that moved him to confer existence. When he made himself known to his creatures, benevolence in like manner moved him to give them laws for their conduct. Benevolence is the spring of legislation in the Deity, as much as it was the motive of creation. He issued his commands on earth on purpose that, by obedience to them, his creatures might be rendered happy among themselves in this life, and be prepared for greater happiness in another.

The above quotation from Dr. Blair, embraces sentiments truly orthodox; but it is a kind of orthodoxy considered very heterodox at the present advanced stage of religious fanaticism. If however, it were more generally received, we may well question whether there would be so much iniquity as there now is in the world. There would be far stronger inducements to obedience, virtue and uprightness. Whatever may be said of the sinfulness of self love, men always act with a view of securing their own happiness, either present or future. Those who are kind and benevolent do not indeed lose sight of the happiness of their fellow creatures; but they do not on that account any the less desire the promotion of their own. And if convinced that law was given for this very purpose, how readily would all obey. Let it then be impressed upon the minds of all that what God requires of us, is required for the advancement of our own happiness.

R. O. W.

UNDERSTANDING THE WORD.—In ancient times it was customary to read the sacred Scriptures for the purpose of understanding their teachings. But we fear that this can not be said in truth, of all, or even a majority of those who read the word of God in our day. Too many read the Bible as a daily and irksome task, because they have been told it is their duty to do so, and not because their minds are instructed or their hearts made glad with the truths which they learn. The effects of reading are as widely different as the manner. In old time Ezra the Scribe, stood in the pulpit of wood, and 'read in the book of the law distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused the people to understand the reading thereof.' 'And the people went their way to eat and drink and to make great mirth, because they understood the words that were declared unto them.' So when Philip came to the eunuch, he said unto him, 'Understandest thou what thou readest? And when he had explained to him the words of the prophet, he went on his way rejoicing.' Thus it will appear that those who read and understand the word will be made happy by that word. On the other hand, those who read and understand not, are tormented with fears and haunted with superstitions, the legitimate children of ignorance. He then that would experience the full joys of christian faith should study the divine word diligently, and at the close of every chapter, he should pause, and ask himself the serious question, Understandest thou what thou readest? I. D. W.

'REMARKS' ON 'PRIZE TALES.'—We published a week or two since, as our readers will recollect, some remarks from the Trumpet over the signature of H. B. in reference to 'Prize Tales.' We now copy from the Magazine and Advocate a few observations from the pen of A. B. G. who is known to be the associate Editor of that paper designed as a reply to the remarks of H. B. Justice requires that we should give both sides a hearing.

It is quite possible that many things may be said both for and against the publication of familiar tales, designed either as proof or illustration of Universalism. We are not disposed however to enter into a controversy on the subject, nor say anything to the injury of those excellent brethren who have procured at considerable expense several well written tales. That they are designed and published as fiction is true; but we may be allowed, perhaps, to mention one fact, out of many that might be mentioned, which will show that they are not always read and received as such. A gentleman, apparently a man of sense, but evidently a very careless reader, once inquired of us, 'if we could tell him where the town of Z was, where that old deacon turned his daughter out door?' We confess we could hardly suppress a smile; but at the same time we were convinced that such men ought to be fed with plain truth, presented in a manner so very simple that it could not be misunderstood.

Now if these things be done in a green tree what shall be done in the dry? It is no vain boast to say that Universalists generally are better acquainted with theological subjects than some other denominations; and if they are sometimes deceived, will not Unitarians be very apt, perhaps wilfully, to confound fiction with fact, so far as facts are related in Universalist periodicals relative to the influence of Unitarian notions, and condemn the whole as fiction? And can they not do it with a better grace, since fiction is published in our papers—acknowledged indeed to be mere fiction, but designed as a representation of fact.

We do not wish to be understood as opposing or condemning familiar tales. We merely suggest these things as objections; which, however, may be, and perhaps are, counterbalanced by the good resulting from them. We must leave the subject and give the remarks of A. B. G.

Sometimes fair truth in fiction we disguise

Sometimes present her naked to men's eyes.' [Hesiod.

The foregoing remarks from the pen, it is believed, of an aged preacher, of Boston, has been pretty extensively copied into our periodicals, and approved by many of our editorial brethren. I

may, therefore, savor strongly of presumption in the writer to enter an exception to its justness and propriety. But I conceive myself called on to do so more imperiously for the very reason that it has now more weight, than if first penned by as humble an individual as myself, and copied coldly into but one periodical. Besides, I write merely to correct one mistake in it—a thing to which all men are more or less liable. The mistake is this: It seems to me to misstate the whole and sole object of all the 'prize tales' yet published in our order.

1. Why do Universalists object to the publication of fictitious narratives by the Tract society? First—because that association has always opposed all works of fiction as highly demoralizing and pernicious—has issued tracts against novel reading—and in thus violating its own laws and instructions, they deserve our reprobation for their inconsistency. Second—because they have alleged, in some cases, and pretended in others, that their narratives were facts when they were fictions only. They, moreover, publish their fictions as facts—never prefacing them with the declaration that they were mere 'tales.' In thus doing they are guilty of falsehood actual or tacit. And third—Universalists condemn such tracts because they are offered as *proofs*, rather than *illustrations*, that our doctrine, &c., is false and pernicious—and to render them more effectual, they misrepresent the views these tracts are intended to oppose.

2. But Br. H. B. and the applauders of his article will excuse me for saying that not a single 'prize tale' published in our periodicals is obnoxious to any one of these charges. We condemn not fiction when not written to deceive or injure. We publish no tales for true occurrences, but simply as tales. We offer them not as *proofs* that Universalism is true, or Partialism false, but simply as *illustrative* of the effects of these opposite sentiments on the life and character of individuals.—And in doing so, care has been taken not to misrepresent the sentiments of our opposers. Certainly it is not done, unless the best essays and sermons of our order have done it also.

3. That it is *proper* thus to employ fiction in the service of truth, no one acquainted with his Bible will deny. For what are its parables and similes—its tropes and figures—so often used by the prophets, our Savior and his apostles—but tales and fictitious representations, used not to deceive or injure, but to impress, persuade, and benefit? (See prodigal Son, unjust Steward, rich man and Lazarus, &c.) What is all poetry and the imagery of every prose writer, but the same?

In conclusion—I have never yet had the pleasure of hearing Br. B., but from what I have heard and read of his sermons, I venture to say that we have few preachers in our order who more frequently illustrate Universalism, its bearings, and effect, by *supposed cases*, (*alias short tales*), than he does. And, for my part, I can see no difference in principle between *many short tales*, and *one long one*—or between tales in the *desk* and tales in our *periodicals*.

I am no writer of prize tales, and perhaps on that account would prefer prize *essays*—for I believe *proof* and *illustration* could be combined in an essay better than in a tale—but I believe justice to those who write and favor such productions, require that, as long as they publish them as tales, and use no misrepresentation, they should not be confounded and condemned with the deceiving scribblers of the American Tract Society.

A. B. G.

THE JAILOR'S QUESTION.—'What must I do to be saved.'

We suppose this question was put by the jailor in reference to the danger that threatened him. It was in the darkness of night, and the foundations of the prison were tottering with the violence of an earthquake. The doors of the prison were open and the prisoners could all escape, and in such an event the keeper would suffer for a neglect of duty. In such



circumstances as these, he was afraid, and inquired what he should do to secure his personal safety. It is not our intention however to give a labored exposition of this matter. This has often been done by abler pens than ours. We only design to offer a few suggestions which are calculated to show that the common use of the passage is improper. It is usually supposed that the jailor desired to know what he should do to escape hell in another world. But there are a few things which will show that such was not the fact.

1. His conduct does not correspond with such an opinion. The context informs us that the moment before he put the question he drew his sword and would have plunged it to his heart but for the friendly interposition of the prisoner.

Now according to popular usage we must suppose that the jailor was afraid of hell. He saw the burning lake glowing beneath his feet, and vorily believed that the moment he was dead he should fall into its flames. He was sore afraid. He wanted to be saved from hell, and so he drew his sword in order to kill himself, and get there as soon as possible! Fine logic!!

2. There is no evidence that the jailor ever heard of hell. Paul never told him any thing about it unless he preached very differently from his common mode of preaching, for we do not know that Paul used such a word in the whole course of his ministry.—Whoever says that the jailor's fears originated in such a cause, can give us his assertion, and this is the whole amount of evidence that he can present in favor of such an opinion.

It would be well however for those who are so fond of imitating the jailor, or of extorting his question from their fellows, to remember that he was a heathen, and there is not the least evidence that he ever heard a christian sermon, in his life, before he propounded this question.

Suppose then this heathen jailor was actually afraid of an endless hell, and what does it prove? Why, it just proves that this doctrine of an endless hell is an old heathen fable and that is what we hold it in fact to be. So then because a poor heathen, who was as ignorant of christianity as a Hottentot was afraid of going to hell, we are to believe this is a Christian doctrine!! Out upon such reasoning as this. It may do to frighten the credulous, but candid and reasonable men, must have better evidence, than the mere opinion of a heathen jailor, before they can receive this as an important item in the faith of Christ.

*Mannasseh's wickedness.*—When Mannasseh was king of Judah, he did evil in the sight of the Lord like unto the abominations of heathen. He built groves for Baalim, and altars for all the host of heaven, observed times, used enchantments and witchcraft, offered sacrifices to Moloch, the Ammonitish god, and, worse than all, 'caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of Hinnom.' Such was the practice of this wicked and idolatrous king, for which he was condemned and severely punished by the most High.

Now we wish to inquire, are not modern revivalists proceeding on precisely the same principles? Are they not practicing every kind of enchantment for the advancement of their own peculiar views and schemes? Are they not building *al ars* and *anxious seats* in the house of God, and causing the people to err, and do worse than the heathen? If they do not sacrifice to Moloch, do they not cause their children to pass through the fire—of religious excitement? And, if they do not cause them to go through the fire in the valley of Hinnom, do they not sometimes set them

before the fire of a heated oven in order to *roast* religion into them? Let them beware lest a more fearful curse fall upon them than was sent upon the idolatrous king of Judah. Let them cease their enchantments, pull down their idolatrous altars and anxious seats, and no more cause their children to pass through the fire, or they may expect a more signal display of divine vengeance than the Assyrian captivity.

Br. D. R. Biddlecom wishes all letters and papers intended for him directed to Perysbuch, Wood co. Ohio.

Br. Bulkley, having fixed his residence in New-York city, desires all letters, papers, &c. designed for him, to be addressed him: 'Care of P. Price, 2, Chatham-Square, N. Y.'

Br. Alfred Peck, has removed from Vernal to Le Roy, Gen. co. to which latter place all letters and papers designed for him should be directed. He will preach with the society in that place, and the one in Covington.

The new Universalist Church at Gaines, (Fair-Haven, Orleans co. N. Y.) will be dedicated to the worship of the only true God, tomorrow. Sermon by Br. S. R. Smith.

*Another Preacher.*—Br. A. C. Thomas informs, the public, through the Christian Messenger, that Br. D. C. Smith, a member of the Callowhill (Universalist church,) Philadelphia, entered the harvest field as a servant of the Lord on Thursday evening, the 23d ult. His discourse was well received by a respectable audience, and Br. S. is spoken of as a worthy man.

**DEDICATION AT GUILFORD, N. H.**—The following from the 'Star and Universalist' brings us the happy tidings of the dedication of a Union Meeting House in Guilford, N. H.

The Dedication of the Union Meeting House at Guilford, took place on Thursday last. The day was fine and the scene was joyful. Ministers and people of different opinions came together and separated in the sweet bonds of the gospel. There was nothing occurred in the conduct or speech of any one that was calculated to disturb our peace—we could truly say, in the joy of our hearts, that this place is no less than the house of God and the gate of heaven! The house is a very excellent one well finished and painted, and calculated to hold about five hundred persons—it is an honor to the two denominations, (Universalist and Christian,) who have erected it. May they long continue to enjoy it in the harmonious spirit of the Great Head of the Church. The order of the services at the Dedication were as follows:—

Invocation, by Rev. Mr. Sinclair, of Guilford; Reading of Scriptures, by Rev. Mr. Blaisdel, of Guilford; Dedictory Prayer, by Rev. Mr. McCauley, of Sandbornton; Sermon, by Mr. Bartlett, of Hookinton, Isa. xxxiii. 22. Address to the people, and concluding prayer, by Rev. Mr. Atkinson of Meredith. Benediction, by Rev. Mr. Bartlett.—All these services were attended to in a very solemn and devout manner by the inhabitants of Guilford and the neighboring towns.

#### NOTICE.

A meeting of the First Independent Universalist Society of Hartford, will be held at their meeting House on Tuesday evening the 25th inst. at 7 o'clock, to consider a request of the Rev. M. H. Smith to be discharged from the office of Pastor of said society, and also to transact such other business as circumstances may require.

By order of the Committee.

Hartford, May 19, 1835.

PLEASURE is eagerly sought for by all classes of men. But few find true and substantial pleasure.—The reason for this disappointment is perfectly obvious. They engage in those pursuits which lead them directly from the object of their search.

We sometimes hear men speak of the pleasures of sin; but nothing can be more absurd. As well

may we expect grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles, as to expect to obtain true and lasting pleasure, from an indulgence in crime of any description. Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are paths of peace. It is, therefore, only in the observance of her wholesome councils, that we obtain our object. Pope wisely says—

'Virtue alone is happiness below.'

Let the young, and all who are in pursuit of pleasure, bear in mind this one thing, that it cannot be obtained, except in the practice of holiness. 'In God's presence is fulness of joy, and at his right hand are pleasures for ever more.' Of these pleasures we may now partake, if we will but cultivate a spirit of love; for God is love, and he who dwells in love, dwelleth in God, and God dwells in him. It is perfectly plain, that if we dwell in love, we shall enjoy the presence of our God, and therefore shall partake of the never failing pleasures which he has in store for us.

S. D.

#### Religious Notices.

Br. C. Woodhouse, of Lansingburg, will preach at Newark, N. J., on the 4th Sabbath in May.

Br. W. A. Stickney will preach at Killingworth on the 5th Sunday inst. and at Durham on Monday evening June 1st.

Br. W. A. Stickney will preach in Burlington the 4th Sunday in May, and a lecture at New Hartford centre, at 5 o'clock.

Br. R. O. Williams will preach in Berlin on the 5th Sabbath—Br. J. Shrigley will preach at West Suffield same day.

Br. J. Shrigley will preach at Barkhamsted on the 4th Sabbath inst. and lecture at New Hartford in the evening of the same day—Br. Hitchcock will preach at Wolcottville same day.

Br. F. Hitchcock will preach at Cornwall Hollow Saturday evening the 6th of June, and Sunday morning the 7th, services commencing at precisely half past 9. At Limerack village in Salisbury in the afternoon, commencing at half past 12. And at Hitchcock's Corner in Armenia N. Y. at 5 o'clock.

**HUDSON RIVER ASSOCIATION.** The Hudson River Association of Universalists, will hold an extra session in the city of New York, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 11th and 12th of June next. Ministering brethren and all friends are affectionately invited to attend. Per order. I. D. WILLIAMSON, Clerk.

**NEW-YORK STATE CONVENTION.**—The Universalist Convention of the State of New-York will hold its annual session at Cooperstown, Otsego county, on the last Wednesday and Thursday (27th and 28th days) of May inst.

#### CLINTON LIBERAL INSTITUTE.

The present term of the Liberal Institute will close on the 8th, and the Summer term commence on the 27th day of May inst. The ladies' school of the Institute will close and commence again at the same time. The best accommodations can be had for the students.

J. STEBBINS, } Executive { T. SMITH.  
D. PICKLEY, } Committee. { E. S. BARNUM,  
J. W. HALE, }

\*. Editors friendly to unsectarian institutions of learning will please copy the above.

**NOTICE.**—The residence of the subscriber as also the office of the Inquirer and Anchor, in Albany will be at No. 88. Beaver Street, from and after the first of May.

I. D. WILLIAMSON.



## POETRY.

[The following lines from the pen of the late Miss Louisa S. Griswold, were addressed to her sister who was about to leave her friends and take up her abode in the 'far, far west.'

## To my Sister.

Original.

Onward—aye boldly onward, speed thee on thy way,  
O'er mountain, lake and mighty stream, in distant lands  
to stray,  
And leave thy own New England, and haste thee from  
its shore,  
Thou ne'er may'st breathe its fragrant air, or view its  
bright scenes more.  
Yet seek that earthly paradise, that world of bliss and  
rest,  
With all who hope to find it, in the bright, the far, far  
West—  
Perchance 'twill o'er thy destiny a ray of glory cast,  
And cold oblivion's shadowy veil will hide from thee  
the past,  
And high thy name may dazzling shine on fames record-  
ing scroll  
There, where the noble and the brave alone their names  
enrol.  
Then on—with wild ambition to lead thee proudly forth  
Over the far stretch'd western world, that land of wealth  
and worth;  
Nor stay thy rapid progress, till Mississippi's wave—  
Between thee and thy native land its pebbled beaches  
lave,  
Till the high and rocky mountains unchanging and the  
same,  
Have dwindled into distance, till the boundless western  
main  
Is spread before thy gaze—nor homeward turn thine eye,  
But like one bright and gifted one 'go to the west and  
die.'

## The triumph of Faith.

A BRIEF TALE.

Emily H—was a lovely girl. There was always upon her fresh countenance a smile imprinted; and that sprightly gaiety, which is the legitimate attendant of innocence, was ever a peculiar trait of her attractive nature. She had no enemies, for none could do otherwise than love her—for she was lovely; and what is lovely will be beloved when known. Those who have seen the playful lamb skip over the lawn, and return in its sport to its dam, have seen Emily hasten and seek for her flowers, and return and present to her mother, with an eagerness big with affection, the sweet garland she had gathered and woven.

How beautiful is nature in *innocence*! How beautiful in the first estate, as first from the hand of our God, is man, the handiwork of Jehovah! Who can reflect and not love—who cannot hope that *all* who are marred by the bruises of sin, shall be restored to their primitive state! But to return

The parents of Emily, educated in the truths of divine revelation, instructed her in the knowledge of the parental character of the Father of the universe. Her young mind had the free exercise of its own natural sprightliness, and that elastic vivacity which already gave animation to her soul, acquired, daily, new life as she advanced in the knowledge of God. But the stores of her garnered faith were unknown by even her friends, until the hour most trying of all, tested her confidence in Him who is love. I say her faith was not known—I mean the *extent* of it. Was she like the noisy professor, clamorous of her own perfection and the sins of others? Was she like the bigoted being, declaring self-right-

eousness in public and private, and claiming the first seat in the mansions of bliss! O let Emily rest from such charges. Like a reservoir hidden in the earth and in silence, which from rivulets still is receiving, in tribute, the waters to fill its calm bosom, whilst on the surface that covers it over, the herbage and evergreens grow—so the mind of Emily received from all sources, in silence, the knowledge of God, and showed in her works the fruits of her love.

But she was not long to stay below, for angels are for heaven. She had scarcely seen her eighteenth year before she was called to pay her debt to nature. A fell disease brought her suddenly upon the bed of death, whilst in the strength and beauty and buoyant hopes of life. But was she alarmed—did she dread her departure? Let the sequel decide. When the cold hand of death was fast marbling her body—whilst her parents and friends were encircled around her, to witness the death of one so fondly beloved, in slow accents she raised her enfeebled voice and said—'Father, don't mourn my departure—I am only returning home. Remember how often I have heard from your lips that our Father in heaven is *love*, and that all are to dwell in his presence in heaven and enjoy the sweet peace of his smiles forever. Oh, father, how those words and parental instructions have delighted my bosom! 'See there, my dear child 'you have said, 'look over the vast field of creation—behold the wisdom, the power and the goodness of God.' I looked and beheld, and I learned the rich nature and character of God,—in the flowers of the field I have seen him—in the songs of the birds I have heard him—in the stars of the firmament, and all the grand works of his hands, I have read him—and—O, that I could weep—in my heart—in my heart have I felt him.

'Father—you gave me a bed in the garden—I have sown it with seeds—yes, you gave me a bed, and God gave flowers. I wed them and cherished them—the kind Giver I saw in their growth, in their leaves and their blossoms. How oft have I walked in the alleys around them in still meditation of Him who blest me so kindly with gifts! Yes, there is my lily now growing—my pinks and my violets are blooming—my roses have faded and fallen. Don't mourn, my dear father—I once used to mourn when the flowers of my garden did fade—but I learned that the hand that gave them, in wisdom and kindness, blasted them to renew their rich beauties and sweeten my gifts. Then I no longer mourned when they fell. Yes; the cold frost cut them off that they might bloom fresh again with the Spring.

'Thus I too must fade that I may bloom in the garden of heaven. So, father, farewell—for the present.

'My mother—you are weeping. Don't you remember when you and I watched the chrysalis burst from its cell—how it changed from the worm that was loathsome, to the butterfly, gilded with colors so golden? Don't you remember how it spread forth its wings in their splendor, and arose from the earth in a triumph and alighted on the rose in my hand! Oh! mother—don't you remember that beautiful type? Don't mourn. I am but changing to arise in a triumph o'er death to the splendor and bliss of the angels above.—You may weep—for affection must weep—but don't mourn my departure.

'Fond brothers and sisters—why should you be grieved? I know we have lived in affection

and joined in the sports of our youth—we have encircled our parents in love—but we know that our Father in heaven requires that we die, to ascend to join in the world of spirits made holy and happy in love. I leave you my garden of flowers. O, look through the blossoms that grow on the bed where I have spent my mornings in pruning and weeding, and see the wise Power that exists and causes all nature to live.—How deep and how rich is the volume!

'I grow cold—this clod is fast sinking—I'm fainting—my spirit is almost on wing—our Saviour ascended in triumph over death, an assurance that all should ascend. Oh, the depths of his love—the extent of his glory! Like the lily I droop—like the chrysalis I change—like our Saviour ascend. O—don't—mourn.'

The frost cleft the rose in its bloom, and it fell faded and lifeless to earth. The spot where it fell was a hallowed spot, made sacred by a triumph so great.

Oh, what a prize is such a resignation! How worlds sink into nothingness in comparison with it.

Such a faith drawn from the handiwork of God—from the nature of his providence, and from the records of revelation, is life even in death. It has a power that bursts asunder the gates and bars of the tomb, and wafts the soul in joyous anticipations, in the likeness of the spirit of our Saviour, to the realms of everlasting holiness and happiness. Shall I hold up in contrast with it the faith drawn from the man-made creeds of Partialism? God forbid. I will not mar the perfection of its character—I will not violate heaven by such a contrast. No. Let it stand in the solitude of its own celestial holiness and perfection, unsoiled by an unhalloved touch. I will lay aside my pen, sensible of my inability to write upon so exalted a theme—one robed in a white ethereal habit—before I stain its spotless purity by an evil touch—and only dwell in contemplation. Mag. & Adv.

Moral conduct springs from the mutual wants and interests of mankind. It is each man's interest that his neighbor should be virtuous; hence each man knows that public opinion will approve his conduct; if virtuous—reproach it, if vicious.

The Lord preserveth the strangers; he relieveth the fatherless and widow; but the way of the wicked he turneth upside down. Psalmist.

## Marriages.

In Sheshequin on the 2d instant by Evangelist Samuel Ashton, Maj. David L. Scott of Towanda, to Miss Julia H. Kinney of the former place.

## Deaths.

At Stafford April 30, 1835 Mr. David Tibbils aged 36 years formerly of Springfield.

In this city, Catharine, aged 14 months, daughter of Gen. Nathan Johnson.

In Hebron, widow Charissa Way, aged 58 relict of the late Daniel S. Way.

## REMOVAL.

THE OFFICE of the Inquirer and Anchor is removed to the building formerly owned and occupied by Mr. N. Ruggles in Main St. a few rods south west of the State House square.

Hartford, April 1835.